

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 17 and 30 have been amended for clarification purposes. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 9, 26 and 40 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-8, 10-25, 27-39 and 41-47 will be pending in the present application, with claims 1, 17 and 30 being independent.

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended to applicants' representative, Mr. Sung Kim, during a personal interview conducted on April 3, 2008. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

1. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27, 29-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dynamic HTML: The Next Generation of User Interface Design Using HTML (hereinafter "Microsoft"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action on pages 4 and 16 asserts that Microsoft teaches wherein code is not included in the document (citing page 2). Applicants disagree with this assertion.

Microsoft discloses that conventional HTML does not allow developers to create appealing and interactive applications because it is essentially static. Therefore, any interactive feature of a page that, when activated, results in a significant change to the page's appearance requires new HTML code from the server, that is, another round trip over the Internet, making the page less responsive and taxing web server resources (see page 1, 3rd paragraph, lines 4-9).

Microsoft discloses that a benefit of Dynamic HTML is that developers have more options for programming their pages creatively since the entire contents of a web page are exposed as a collection of open, extensible, scriptable objects (see page 3, 5th paragraph, lines 1-

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/316,897
Attorney Docket Number: 111399.01
Filing Date: May 20, 1999

5). This allows Dynamic HTML to capture and respond immediately to a user's actions, without having to contact a remote server. Therefore, as discussed during the interview, Microsoft teaches that script (i.e., code) is included in the web pages using Dynamic HTML in order to avoid the problems associated with static HTML relating to the need for repetitive server contact.

Microsoft also teaches that with Dynamic HTML, interactive behavior is fully integrated with the expressive power of HTML, and integrated directly into the browser's page display (see page 2, 3rd paragraph, lines 4-6). Additionally, Microsoft teaches that with Dynamic HTML, search results pages can be programmed with scripts that provide a detailed synopsis of any listing when a mouse is passed over it, eliminating redundant fetches from a server (see page 2, 8th paragraph, lines 4-6). Furthermore, Microsoft discloses that developers have other options for adding dynamic behavior to their pages, such as writing custom embedded objects in Java, Visual Basic or C++ (see page 2, 3rd paragraph, lines 1-2). Therefore, as discussed during the interview, Microsoft clearly teaches including scripts or code into a document.

In contrast, as discussed in the present specification, one benefit of separating script (i.e., code) from content in web pages is improved manageability of the web pages (see page 11, lines 11-15; page 14, lines 11-15; page 3, lines 8-10). By including script in the web pages, as taught by Microsoft, the benefits of separating script from content would not be realized.

Therefore, Microsoft fails to disclose or suggest, at the sections cited by the Office Action or elsewhere, the elements of wherein code for determining a behavior of the representation of the element is not included in the document, as included in independent claim 1. Independent claims 17 and 30 include similar elements.

Since Microsoft fails to teach or even suggest every element of claims 1, 17 and 30, these claims are allowable.

Claims 2-7 and 10-16 depend from claim 1. Claims 18-19, 21-25, 27 and 29 depend from claim 17. Claims 31-39 and 41-47 depend from claim 30. As discussed above, claims 1, 17 and 30 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 2-7, 10-16, 18-19, 21-25, 27, 29, 31-39 and 41-47 are also allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/316,897
Attorney Docket Number: 111399.01
Filing Date: May 20, 1999

1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27, 29-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully requested.

2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 8, 20 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft in view of Customization of Distributed Systems Using COM (hereinafter “Wang et al.”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Microsoft fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 17. Wang et al. fails to cure this defect.

Wang et al. discloses customization of distributed systems using component object models (COM). However, Wang et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of wherein code is not included in the document, as included in independent claims 1 and 17.

Therefore, since Microsoft and Wang et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 17, these claims are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Claims 20 and 28 depend from claim 17. As discussed above, claims 1 and 17 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 8, 20 and 28 are also allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 20 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

3. Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/316,897
Attorney Docket Number: 111399.01
Filing Date: May 20, 1999

PATENT

call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: April 10, 2008

By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

April 10, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/316,897
Attorney Docket Number: 111399.01
Filing Date: May 20, 1999